

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please amend FIG. 2 to add the identifying numeral 260 and its associated lead line pointing to the second TDL 230 and its respective inputs and outputs. A replacement FIG. 2 that incorporates this clarification is enclosed herewith. (see next page)

REMARKS

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, 7, 17, and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The claims have been rewritten to include allowable subject matter in all claims as indicated below.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 8-14 are allowed.

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 4, 7, 17, and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With respect to claim 3, the limitations of claim 3 have been included in claim 1 by this Amendment. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 1 is now allowable.

With respect to claim 4, claim 4 depends upon claim 1, as amended, and is believed to be allowable since it contains all the limitations of claim 1 and claims non-obvious combinations thereof.

Additionally, the Examiner has stated that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 therefore has been rewritten in independent form as newly presented claim 21.

With respect to claim 7, claim 7 depends upon claim 1, as amended, and is believed to be allowable since it contains all the limitations of claim 1 and claims non-obvious combinations thereof.

Additionally, the Examiner has stated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

claims. Claim 7 therefore has been rewritten in independent form as newly presented claim 22.

With respect to claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been included in claim 15 by this Amendment. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 15 is now allowable.

With respect to claim 18, claim 18 depends upon claim 15, as amended, and is believed to be allowable since it contains all the limitations of claim 15 and claims non-obvious combinations thereof.

Additionally, the Examiner has stated that original claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 18 therefore has been rewritten in independent form as newly presented claim 23.

Applicant submits that claims 1, 4, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are allowable, and such action is hereby solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1 , 2, 5, 6, 15, 16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abrosimov et al. (U.S. 2001/0056332 A1, hereinafter “Abrosimov”).

With regard to claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 3. In light of the Examiner’s indication of allowability of a claim so constructed, Applicant submits that this rejection is now moot, and claim 1, as amended, is now allowable. Such action is hereby solicited.

With regard to claims 2, 5, and 6, claims 2, 5, and 6 depend upon claim 1, as amended and are believed to be allowable since these claims contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim non-obvious combinations thereof. Accordingly, Applicant submits these rejections are now moot, and allowance of these claims is hereby solicited.

With regard to claim 15, claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 17. In light of the Examiner's indication of allowability of a claim so constructed, Applicant submits that this rejection is now moot, and claim 15, as amended, is now allowable. Such action is hereby solicited.

With regard to claims 16, 19, and 20, claims 6, 19, and 20 depend upon claim 15, as amended and are believed to be allowable since these claims contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim non-obvious combinations thereof. Accordingly, Applicant submits these rejections are now moot, and allowance of these claims is hereby solicited.

Applicants submit the foregoing rejections are moot in view of the amendments to the claims. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 15, 16, 19, and 20 are in condition for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because all black boxes in Fig. 1 need text labels; the timing circuitry 260 is not labeled in Figure 2; and the Examiner cannot determine which elements of the drawings form the timing circuitry 255 and 260.

The drawings were objected to because labels were purportedly missing. The Examiner has stated:

“all black boxes in Fig. 1 need text labels”

It also was stated that the applicant must submit drawings with labels, and that the objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicant respectfully traverses this objection. The principle elements therein would all be readily understood by those having ordinary skill in the art by reference to the Applicant's detailed description without the need for labeled textual descriptions in the drawings.

Also, labeled textual descriptions are not required under 37 CFR §1.74, which specifies that:

“...the detailed description of the invention shall refer...to the different parts by use of reference letters or numerals (preferably the latter).”

Additionally, since the USPTO is a PCT receiving office and is bound by PCT Rule 11.11, which states that “...drawings shall not contain text matter, except a single word or words, when absolutely indispensable...”, and since such textual matter is clearly not absolutely indispensable in the present drawings, withdrawal of the objections in compliance with controlling PCT Rule 11.11 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also stated:

“the timing circuitry 260 is not labeled in Figure 2”

Figure 2 has been amended to include the reference numeral and lead line for the timing circuitry 260. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection has been overcome. Withdrawal of this objection is warranted, and such action is hereby solicited.

The Examiner also stated:

“the Examiner cannot determine which elements of the drawings form the timing circuitry 255 and 260”

The specification has been amended to clarify which elements of FIG. 2 form the timing circuitry 255 and 260. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection has been overcome. Withdrawal of this objection is warranted, and such action is hereby solicited.

All of the Examiner’s objections to the drawings being traversed or overcome, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections to the drawings.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. Claims 8-14 have been allowed. Allowance of claims 1-2, 4-7, 15-16, and 18-23 at an early date is solicited.

Serial No.: 10/826,197
Group Art Unit: 2816

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1078 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mikio Ishimaru".

Mikio Ishimaru
Registration No. 27,449

The Law Offices of Mikio Ishimaru
1110 Sunnyvale-Saratoga Rd., Suite A1
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
Telephone: (408) 738-0592
Fax: (408) 738-0881
Date: October 12, 2005